

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 were presented for examination. The Office Action rejects claims 1-19. This response amends claims 1 and 11 and cancels claims 2 and 12. Applicants submit that the amendments overcome the rejections and respectfully request that they be withdrawn. Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-19 remain pending in the application.

Applicants are filing this amendment and response within the shortened statutory period. Therefore no fee is due with this filing; however, if a fee is due please charge Deposit Account No. 502295.

Rejection of claims 1-6, and 9-19 under U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 and 9-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ono *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,045,971). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the extent it is maintained, because the cited references do not disclose or suggest all limitations as claimed in the applicants' invention.

Representative claim 1, as amended, recites in pertinent part a "plurality of electrostatic discharge (ESD) tabs, each of the ESD tabs disposed adjacent to a respective opening." The claimed ESD tabs are described in detail in applicants' application at paragraph 0023. The Office Action states that the electrostatic discharge tabs are found in FIG. 19 of Ono. However, neither FIG. 19 itself nor the description associated with FIG. 19 disclose any electrostatic discharge tabs. In fact, nowhere in Ono are electrostatic discharge tabs disclosed or suggested.

For the above reasons, Ono fails to disclose or suggest all the elements of applicants' independent claims 1 as amended. Amended independent claim 11 recites elements and limitations similar to claim 1, and is also patentable in view of Ono for at least those reasons provided for claim 1. Also, claims 3-6, 9, 10 and 13-19 depend directly or indirectly from the independent claims 1 and 11 and, therefore, are patentably distinguishable over Ono. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 9-11, and 13-19.

Amendment and Response
NOR-020 (16102R0)
U.S.S N 10/681 872

Rejection of claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103


The Office Action rejects claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ono. The arguments presented above with respect to Ono are reiterated here with full force and effect. Therefore, claims 7 and 8 are also patentable because they depend indirectly from an allowable basic claim. As such, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 and 8.

CONCLUSION

In view of the arguments made herein, applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and requests early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the applicants' representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003 ext. 13.

Respectfully submitted,


Leigh J. Martinson
Attorney for Applicants
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752

Date: October 15, 2004
Reg. No. 50,749

Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003 ext. 13
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005

Amendment and Response
NOR-020 (16102R0)
I U S N 10/6/01 072